

REMARKS

Claims 35, 39, 40, 46 48 50, 52 and 54 have been amended. Claims 35, 36, 39 to 41 and 45 to 54 remain now active in this application.

Claims 39, 40, 49 to 54 were objected to. The claims have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claims 35, 46, 48, 50, 52 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These claims have been amended to overcome the rejection

Claims 35, 36, 39 to 41, 45, 47, 49, 51 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stupian et al. (U.S. 5,543,363). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 35, from which all other claims depend, requires, among other steps, the step of forming a hydrogen permeable layer onto a surface of the package. No such step is taught or suggested by Stupian et al. The hydrogen permeable layer of Stupian et al. is not “on” but rather “over” the package surface.

Claim 35 further requires that the step of forming a vent be performed after the prior step as recited by :”then forming a vent through said package from said hollow interior region to the exterior of said package through said layer to form; a hydrogen permeable layer over said vent. No such step in the order claimed is taught or suggested by Stupian et al.

It is readily apparent that the method of the subject invention merely requires that the hydrogen permeable layer be formed followed by vent formation beneath the hydrogen permeable layer. This is a very much simpler and economically advantageous procedure as

compared with that of Stupian et al. which requires the steps of first forming the aperture, then adding the adhesion layer 32 and then adding onto the adhesion layer the plate 34 which is designed to dissociate hydrogen atoms only.

Claim 36 further limits claim 35 by requiring that the hydrogen permeable layer be a layer of palladium. No such combination is taught or suggested by Stupian et al.

Claims 39 and 40 further limit claims 35 and 36 by requiring that the device be a gallium arsenide semiconductor. No such combination is taught or suggested by Stupian et al.

Claim 41 further limits claim 40 by further including the step of placing said package in an environment where the concentration of hydrogen is less than the concentration of hydrogen in said hollow region. No such combination is taught or suggested by Stupian et al.

Claims 45, 47, 49, 51 and 53 further limits claim 35 and 36 by requiring that the hydrogen permeable layer be formed by plating. No such combination is taught or suggested by Stupian et al.

Claims 46, 48, 50, 52 and 54 further limit claim 34, 36 and 39 to 41 by requiring that the step of forming a vent in the package be provided by etching said package.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)